

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of this response. Claims 1-17 and 19-33 are currently pending. Of those, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, 19 and 32 have been amended, claim 18 has been canceled and claim 33 has been added. Claims 1, 17, 32 and 33 are independent claims. Example support for amendments made to claims 1, 17 and/or 32 may be found in FIGS. 1 and 2 and paragraphs [0017 - 0018] of the specification.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL

Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Amendment After Final in that all such amendments made to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, 19 and 32, and newly added claim 33 only further clarify limitations previously set forth and do not raise any new issues requiring further consideration and/or search.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter set forth in claims 5-9, 30 and 31. By way of this response, Applicant has added new claim 33, which includes subject matter somewhat similar to that previously set forth in dependent claim 5 and independent claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 33 is in condition for allowance.

DRAWINGS

Applicant notes that the Examiner has not indicated the status of the drawings filed February 6, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the status of such drawings in the next USPTO correspondence.

PRIORITY DOCUMENTS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. §119 and the indication that all certified copies of these priority documents have been received.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's careful consideration of all references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed February 6, 2004 as indicated by the Examiner's initials and signature on the Form PTO-1449.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-4, 10-29 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Bayer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,904, hereinafter referred to as "Bayer"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In FIG. 1 of Bayer, switches S1, S2, S3 and S4 are selectively switched on and off in response to two clock signals CLK and NCLK. The selective switching toggles the voltage regulator circuit between a charging and discharging state. In a charging state, switches S2 and S3 are active and S1 and S4 are inactive. When S2 and S3 are active, input voltage V_{in} flows through the charge pump capacitor C_{pump} to ground, charging the capacitor C_{pump} .

In the discharging state, switches S1 and S4 are active, while switches S2 and S3 are inactive. Input voltage V_{in} and a current comprised of controllable current I_r and constant current I_b flows through the capacitor C_{pump} to the output V_{out} . In this state, the output voltage V_{out} is increased.

Bayer does not, however, disclose the voltage generating circuit of claim 1, including at least a "level shifter circuit selectively changing a level of the input voltage based on a clock signal output from the clock signal generator." The input voltage V_{in} of Bayer is coupled to current sources I_r and I_b and switch structure S1, S2, S3 and S4. However, neither the current source I_r , I_b nor switch structure S1, S2, S3, S4 changes a level of the input voltage. Moreover, the clock signals CLK and NCLK are output from the control circuit 8 only to the switching structure S1, S2, S3, S4, not to any "level shifter circuit," as in claim 1.

Accordingly, while the circuit of Bayer (FIG. 1) arguably includes a clock signal generator 8 and a switching structure S1, S2, S3 and S4, Bayer does not

teach the "level shifting circuit," of claim 1. As such, Applicant requests withdrawal of the above rejection.

For at least reasons somewhat similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 17 and 32 are also in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-4, 10-16 and 19-29 are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependency upon claims 1 or 17.

CONCLUSION

In view of above remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding rejection and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC

By 
Gary D. Yacura
Reg. No. 35,416

GDY/AMW:jcp

Ave

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000